

Kindly amend independent claim 70 and dependent claim 85 as follows:

B1 170 (once amended). An ophthalmic lens, comprising an inner and outer surface, wherein said inner surface is adapted to rest immediately adjacent to the human cornea, wherein said lens has the following properties:

(a) an oxygen permeability from said inner to said outer surface sufficient to prevent substantial corneal swelling during a period of extended wear;

(b) ophthalmic compatibility during a period of extended, continuous, intimate contact with the ocular environment; and

(c) ion or water permeability sufficient to allow lens movement on the eye in an amount sufficient to sustain corneal health and wearer comfort,

wherein said ophthalmic lens has an oxygen transmissibility of at least about 70 barrers/mm and an ion permeability characterized either by (1) an Ionoton Ion Permeability Coefficient of greater than about $0.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$ or (2) an Ionoflux Diffusion Coefficient of greater than about $1.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mm}^2/\text{min}$, wherein said ion permeability is measured with respect to sodium ions. ✓

B2 116 85 (once amended). An ophthalmic lens of claim [1] 70, wherein the ^{lens}polymeric material has a $\tan \delta$ above about 0.25 at about 10 Hz.

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

A cited Kunzler reference and its date was missing in the July 17, 1996 IDS. [page 2, point 15]

Claims **1-3** and **85** were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. [page 2, point 16]

Claims **1-3** have not been canceled because the Examiner did not receive page 99. [page 3, point 17]

Claim **84** stands rejected under *35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph*, as lacking sufficient enablement. [pages 3-4, point 19]

Claims **86-87** and **89-92** stand rejected under *35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph*, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. [page 4, point 20]

Claims **70-84** and **86-92** stand rejected under *35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph*, as lacking sufficient enablement. [pages 4-5, point 21]

Claims **70-84** and **86-92** stand rejected under *35 U.S.C. 102(e)* or *102(b)* as being anticipated by **Lai**, U.S. Patent No. 5,310,779; **McGee**, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,387,663; or **Yokoyama**, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,346,946 . [page 6, item 22]